UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,014	04/25/2006	Johnson Oyama	P18448-US2	1246

27045 7590 04/01/2008

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR 1-C-11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER	
BATISTA, MARCOS	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4134	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/595,014	OYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARCOS BATISTA	4134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 April 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6,8,10,11,15,18,20,23,27,29,30,32,34,36,37,41,43,46,49,53.* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12/16/2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/16/2005, 01/23/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,3,4,6,8,10,11,15,18,20,23,27,29,30,32,34,36,37,41,43,46,49 and 53.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 8, 10 an 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention since claim 8 depends on claim 2 which has been cancelled. Examiner believes that claim 8 should have depended on claim 1 and it's being examined based on that assumption.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 15, 18, 27, 29, 30, 41, 43 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neill (US 20040047348 A1).

Consider claim 1, O'Neill discloses a method of authentication and authorization support for Mobile IP version 6 (MIPv6) ([**0053**]) in a CDMA system ([**0057**]), the method comprising: transferring, between a mobile node (**910**) in a visited network (**920**) and a

home network (**930**) of the mobile node (**910**), MIPv6-related authentication and authorization information in an authentication protocol in an end-to-end procedure transparent to the visited network over an AAA (**905**) infrastructure (**see fig. 11, [0047], [0048], [0057]** – the complete authentication process starts by the mobile node **910** sending a request to the visited network or foreign agent **920**, which sends the request to the AAA **905**, which then forwards the authentication to the home network or home agent **930**).

Consider claim 3, O'Neill discloses wherein the end-to-end procedure is executed between the mobile node and an AAA server in the home network, and nodes in the visited network act as mere pass-through agents in the end-to-end procedure (see fig. 11, [0047], [0048] – the access node or foreign agent in the visited network passes the authentication request from the mobile node to the AAA system, therefore acting as a bridge in the end to end authentication process).

Consider claim 4, O'Neill discloses wherein the MIPv6-related information is transferred in the authentication protocol between the mobile node and the AAA home network server via an internetworking access server located in the visited network (see fig. 11, [0048] – the access node **920** serves as an internetworking server located in the visited network and transfer authentication information from the AAA **905** and the home network or home agent **930**).

Consider claim 15, O'Neill discloses wherein said method further comprises the step of performing, for the purpose of MIPv6 hand-in, CHAP authentication between the mobile node and the home network (see [0047], [0051] – the word challenge refers to the use of the challenge handshake authentication protocol or CHAP).

Consider claim 18, O'Neill discloses wherein the MIPv6-related information is transferred over the AAA infrastructure for allocation of a home agent, for establishing a MIPv6 security association between the mobile node and the home agent and for establishing a binding for the mobile node in the home agent (see fig. 11, [0047], [0050]).

Consider claim 53, O'Neill discloses a system for Mobile IP version 6 (MIPv6) hand-in within a CDMA framework, characterized by means for performing CHAP authentication between a mobile node in a visited network and an AAA server in a home network of the mobile node over an AAA infrastructure (see fig. 11, [0047], [0048], [0051] – the word challenge refers to the use of the challenge handshake authentication protocol or CHAP).

Consider claims 27, 29, 30, 41 and 43, these are system claims corresponding to method claims 1, 3, 4, 15 and 18. Therefore, they have been analyzed and rejected based upon the method claims 1, 3, 4, 15 and 18 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill (US 20040047348 A1), hereafter "O'Neill," in view of Lee et al. (US 20020105934 A1), hereafter "Lee1."

Consider claim 6, O'Neill discloses claim 1 above, but does not particular refer to wherein point-to-point communication between the mobile node and the internetworking access server is configured based on the CSD-PPP protocol. Lee1 teaches a point-to-point communication between the mobile node and the internetworking access server is configured based on the CSD-PPP protocol (see abstract, fig. 5, [0038]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of O'Neill and have it include a point-to-point communication between the mobile node and the internetworking access server is configured based on the CSD-PPP protocol, as taught by Lee1. The motivation would have been in order to considerably reduce the overhead cost (see [0061]).

Consider claim 32, this is system claim corresponding to method claims 6. Therefore, it has been analyzed and rejected based upon the method claim 6 above.

6. Claims 20, 23, 46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill (US 20040047348 A1), hereafter "O'Neill," in view of Lee et al. (US 20030099213 A1), hereafter "Lee2."

Consider claim 20, O'Neill discloses claim 4 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the internetworking access server offers the mobile node the possibility to use PPP or CSD-PPP by sending out a standard PPP/LCP packet and at least a PPPIEAP packet. Lee2 teaches wherein the internetworking access server offers the mobile node the possibility to use PPP or CSD-PPP by sending out a standard PPP/LCP packet and at least a PPP/EAP packet (see [0026]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of O'Neill and have it include wherein the internetworking access server offers the mobile node the possibility to use PPP or CSD-PPP by sending out a standard PPP/LCP packet and at least a PPPIEAP packet, as taught by Lee2. The motivation would have been in order to provide a secure access to the Internet (see [0026]).

Consider claim 23, O'Neill discloses claim 4 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the internetworking access server also sends out a PPPICHAP packet together with the PPP/LCP and PPP/EAP packets. Lee2 teaches wherein the internetworking access server also sends out a PPPICHAP packet together with the PPPILCP and PPP/EAP packets (see [0026]). It would have been obvious to have modified O'Neill with the teaching of Lee2. The motivation would have been in order to provide a secure access to the Internet (see [0026]).

Consider claims 46 and 49, these are system claims corresponding to method claims 20 and 23. Therefore, they have been analyzed and rejected based upon the method claims 20 and 23 respectively.

7. Claims 8, 10, 11, 34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill (US 20040047348 A1), hereafter "O'Neill," in view of Salowey et al. (US 7171555 B1), hereafter "Salowey."

Consider claim 8, O'Neill discloses claim 1 above, but does not particular refer to wherein the authentication protocol is an extended Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) and the MIPv6-related authentication and authorization information is incorporated as additional data in the EAP protocol stack.

Salowey teaches wherein the authentication protocol is an extended Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) and the MIPv6-related authentication and authorization

information is incorporated as additional data in the EAP protocol stack (see col. 6 lines 44-5, col. 7 lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of O'Neill and have it include wherein the authentication protocol is an extended Extensible Authentication Protocol (EAP) and the MIPv6-related authentication and authorization information is incorporated as additional data in the EAP protocol stack, as taught by Salowey. The motivation would have been in order to protect distribution of the credentials without initiating a new session or exchanging special-purpose keys (see col. 3 lines 35-39).

Consider claim 10, O'Neill as modified by Salowey teaches claim 8. But O'Neill, however, does not particular refer to wherein the MIPv6-related information is transferred in a generic container attribute available for any EAP method.

Salowey teaches wherein the MIPv6-related information is transferred in a generic container attribute available for any EAP method (see col. 9 lines 3-5, col. 7 lines 50-53). It would have been obvious to have modified O'Neill with the teaching of Salowey. The motivation would have been in order to protect distribution of the credentials without initiating a new session or exchanging special-purpose keys (see col. 3 lines 35-39).

Consider claim 11, O'Neill as modified by Salowey teaches claim 8. But O'Neill, however, does not particular refer to wherein the MIPv6-related information is transferred in a method-specific generic container attribute of the method layer in the EAP protocol stack. Salowey teaches wherein the MIPv6-related information is transferred in a method-specific generic container attribute of the method layer in the EAP protocol stack (see col. 8 lines 3-8). It would have been obvious to have modified O'Neill with the teaching of Salowey. The motivation would have been in order to protect distribution of the credentials without initiating a new session or exchanging special-purpose keys (see col. 3 lines 35-39).

Consider claims 34, 36 and 37, these are system claims corresponding to method claims 8, 10 and 11. Therefore, they have been analyzed and rejected based upon the method claims 8, 10 and 11 respectively.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marcos Batista, whose telephone number is (571) 270-5209. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Lun-Yi Lao can be reached at (571) 272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Marcos Batista
/M. B./
03/13/2008

/LUN-YI LAO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4134